

REMARKS

I. Objections to Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure, stating that on page 5, line 5, "AC-to-DC inverter" should be changed to "AC-to-DC rectifier." The Examiner bases his objection on U.S. Patent No. 6,384,492 (Iversen et al.)

The specification has been amended to replace the term "AC-to-DC inverter" with the term "AC-to-DC converter." This terminology is shown in numerous places in the art, including the U.S. Patent No. 6,384,492 to Iverson et al. as cited by the Examiner. The terminology is also shown at least in U.S. Patent Nos. 6,483,272, 6,483,252, and 6,477,066. This term is believed common in the relevant art.

Additionally, Applicant refers to the phone conference with the Examiner on this case, which took place on Nov. 20, 2002, at approximately 1 pm. In that interview, the Examiner indicated that the change which has been made to the specification would be acceptable and would add no new matter. This objection is therefore believed overcome.

II. Objections to Claims

The Examiner objected to Claim 7 for the reasons referenced above with respect to the term "AC-to-DC inverter."

Claim 7 has been amended to replace the term "AC-to-DC inverter" with the term "AC-to-DC converter." This terminology is shown in numerous places in the art, including the U.S. Patent No. 6,384,492 to Iverson et al. as cited by the Examiner. The terminology is also shown at least in U.S. Patent Nos. 6,483,272, 6,483,252, and 6,477,066. This term is believed common in the relevant art.

Additionally, Applicant refers to the phone conference with the Examiner on this case, which took place on Nov. 20, 2002, at approximately 1 pm. In that interview, the Examiner indicated that the change which has been made to Claim 7 would be acceptable and would add no new matter. This objection is therefore believed overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2, 3, and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, Claim 2 was rejected for reciting the limitation “the first set of interconnects,” for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. Likewise, Claim 3 recites “the second set of interconnects,” also for which antecedent basis is lacking. Claims 6-8 were rejected for their dependency upon rejected Claim 2.

In response to the Examiner’s comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-3 have been amended in the following manner:

2. The adapter of Claim 1 wherein the *at least one first interconnect* [emphasis added] is physically spaced to correspond to a first pin configuration of a power module.

3. The adapter of Claim 1 wherein the *at least one second interconnect* [emphasis added] is physically spaced to correspond to a second pin configuration of an end user’s circuit board.

Applicant believes that the § 112 rejection of Claims 2, 3, and 6-8 has been overcome. Reconsideration of Claims 2, 3 and 6-8, as amended, is respectfully requested.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Patel et al., hereinafter “Patel,” (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,467). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all limitations of dependent Claim 12, which the Examiner indicated as allowable subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner stated that “Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” Applicant therefore submits amended Claim 1 pursuant to the Examiner’s foregoing comments. It is therefore believed that independent

Claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, are allowable. An indication of such is respectfully requested.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Iversen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,492).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 depends ultimately from Claim 1, which has been amended to include limitations from Claim 12. Claim 1, and thereby Claim 8, are believed allowable according to the Examiner's aforementioned comments. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that Claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Patel in view of McDonnal (U.S. Patent No. 5,075,821).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13 and 14 depend on amended Claim 1 and should therefore be allowed.

VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Date: December 3, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
David W. Carstens
Registration No. 34,134
Attorney for Applicants

CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001 Telephone
(972) 367-2002 Facsimile